APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,205	11/27/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-71519.US.P	7874

7590   09/15/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA   95113

EXAMINER
HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/724,205</td><td>Applicant(s)
ZOLLER ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Phuong N. Hoang</td><td>Art Unit
2126</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 November 2000</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 - 23</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1 - 23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 November 2000</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)　　　　　　4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)　5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .　6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

It does not include the first inventor's signature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mowbray, "The Essential Corba" pages 35 – 53, 184 – 187, 212 – 213, and 250

- 255, in view of UCS "UCS Architecture" page 1 – 2.

As to claim 20, Mowbray teaches in a computer system, means for providing

communication between a Practical Extraction Report Language (PERL) program and a

distributed object comprising:

a) means for translating a call from the script program (wrapping with scripts, p.

253) to a format substantially compliant with a Common Object Request Broker

Architecture (IDL, page 35 – 53).

b) means for translating a response from the call to a format substantially

compliant with the script program (IDL, page 35 – 53).

Mowbray does not teach the script written in Practical Extraction Report

Language (PERL).

UCS teaches script application is written in PERL (Perl, page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of UCS to Mowbray's system

because Perl is also one of pure scripting languages, and it is a design choice to write

the application in any language.

As to claim 21, Mowbray teaches the means for providing communication of

Claim 20 further comprising:

means to access the distributed object (data object, page 186) via Common

Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) (ORB, p. 184 – 187 on fig. 7.9 – 7.12).

As to claim 22, 23, Mowbray teaches the means for providing communication of

Claim 20 wherein the means for translating the call from the PERL program comprises:

means for converting a data structure into a form or request (IDL, p. 35 – 53)

which is substantially compliant with a program which accesses the distributed object

via the Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA).

As to claim 1, this is the method claim of claim 20 for b) and e) and claim 21 for

c). Further, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches:

a) receiving a request from the PERL program, the request specifying the

distributed object (Mowbray, ORB, page 250 on figure 8.2, p. 185 on fig. 7.10);

d) receiving a response from the call in the step c) (Mowbray, ORB receives the

response from object Implementation, p. 185 on fig. 7.10).

f) passing the translated response from the step e) to the PERL program

(Mowbray, ORB passes the response back to client, fig. 7. 10 of page 185, fig. 8.3 of

page 255) .

As to claim 2, see claim 22 above.

As to claim 3, Mowbray teaches client stub (client stub, fig. 3.2 and 3.4 on page

38 – 42).

As to claim 4, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches the method of Claim 1

wherein the step b) comprises the step of: b1) an adapter program converting the PERL

request into a request which is substantially compliant with the Common Object

Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) format (Mowbray, IDL, p. 35 – 53).

As to claim 5, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches the method of Claim 4

wherein the adapter program is written in a first programming language (IDL, Mowbray

on p. 35 – 53) and the PERL application is written in second programming language

(scripting language, UCS page 1), the first and the second programming languages

being different.

As to claim 6, Mowbray teaches the method of Claim 4 wherein the adapter

program is substantially compliant with the C programming language (C, Mowbray on

page 40 on section "Implementating OMG IDL Specification.").

As to claim 7, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches the method of Claim 1

wherein the PERL program is located on a first computer system and the distributed

object is located on a second computer system (UCS, Accesing UCS components

through a Remote Web Server, page 2 last paragraph).

As to claim 8, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches the method of Claim 1 wherein the step e) comprises the step of: e1) an adapter program (IDL, p. 35 – 53) converting a data structure into a form which is substantially compliant with the Practical Extraction Report Language.

As to claim 9, Mowbray teaches the method of Claim 1 wherein the step e) comprises the step of: e1) for a plurality of objects (object services, page 47 - 48) described in an Interface Definition Language (IDL), providing a corresponding plurality of translations in an adapter program, wherein the adapter program translates between a communication program and the PERL program (it is the functionality of adapter).

As to claim 10, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches the method of Claim 1 further comprising the step of:

g) the PERL program accessing user information over a number of databases (database, page 185) by connecting to a server via the CORBA.

As to claim 11, this is the instructions claim of claim 1. See claim 1 for rejection.

As to claim 12, see claim 4 above.

As to claim 13, Mowbray teaches he computer readable medium of Claim 11 having further stored therein the PERL program; and wherein the distributed object is located on a remote computer system (Mowbray teaches the system is client-server environment which is remote computer system, p. 212 – 213).

As to claim 14, see claim 3 above.

As to claim 15, Mowbray teaches the computer readable medium of Claim 14 wherein the step b) of the method comprises the step of: b1) converting a data structure

into a form (IDL, p. 42) which is substantially compliant with the data structures of the client stub.

As to claim 16, it is inherent in the computer readable medium of Claim 11 having further stored therein the PERL program and the distributed object.

As to claim 17, see claim 8 above.

As to claim 18, see claim 9 above.

As to claim 19, Mowbray modified by UCS teaches Perl-xs (perl ext., figure on page 1).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

ph
September 5, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100